



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9435		
Country/Region:	Cuba		
Project Title:	Introduction of New Farming Methods for the Conservation and Sustainable use of Biodiversity, Including Plant and Animal Genetic Resources, in Production Landscapes in Selected Areas of Cuba.		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-3 Program 7; BD-4 Program 9;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$2,973,288
Co-financing:	\$23,792,590	Total Project Cost:	\$26,765,878
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	October 03, 2016
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Sarah Wyatt	Agency Contact Person:	Allan Hruska

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	<p>March 24, 2016</p> <p>Yes. This project is a good combination of BD programs 7 and 9, agrobiodiversity and mainstreaming. In particular, the mainstreaming activities (biodiversity friendly farm management practices) will be undertaken in buffer zones of protected areas with high biodiversity value, including KBAs. The project</p>	

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		lists the Aichi Targets supported and has SMART indicators.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>March 24, 2016</p> <p>Yes. This project is consistent with national strategies.</p>	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>March 24, 2016</p> <p>Yes. This project addresses all of these issues.</p> <p>During PPG, please provide analysis of the potential success of the Geographic Indicator labeling system. These types of activities have had mixed success in previous GEF interventions. It is important to address the market challenges of maintaining agrobiodiversity, so this component requires careful consideration.</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>March 24, 2016</p> <p>Yes. This project shows good incremental reasoning.</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>March 24, 2016</p> <p>Yes. The project components are coherent and clear.</p> <p>At PPG, please use IUCN Red List categories consistently throughout</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		(Table 1).	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	March 24, 2016 Yes. With PPG, please include further information about how project design and implementation has been and will be gender sensitive.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	March 24, 2016 Yes.	
	• The focal area allocation?	March 24, 2016 Yes.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• Focal area set-aside?	NA	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	March 24, 2016 Yes. The PM recommends CEO PIF clearance.	
Review Date	Review	March 24, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.